



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/576,927	05/23/2000	Richard Reisman	1311.1200	3435

5514 7590 09/30/2003

FITZPATRICK CELLA HARPER & SCINTO  
30 ROCKEFELLER PLAZA  
NEW YORK, NY 10112

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, QUANG N

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2141

6

DATE MAILED: 09/30/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/576,927

Applicant(s)

REISMAN, RICHARD

Examiner

Quang N. Nguyen

Art Unit

2141

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 May 2000.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-31 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-31 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 23 May 2000 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

## Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 4-5.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

Art Unit: 2141

***Detail Action***

1. This Office Action is in response to the application SN 09/576,927 filed on 05/23/2000. Claims 1-31 are presented for examination.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) and the Intellectual Property and High Technology Technical Amendments Act of 2002 do not apply when the reference is a U.S. patent resulting directly or indirectly from an international application filed before November 29, 2000. Therefore, the prior art date of the reference is determined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

3. **Claims 1-5, 8-12, 15-19, 22-26 and 29-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Berstis et al. (US 6,092,100), herein after referred as Berstis.**

4. As to claim 1, Berstis teaches a method for finding, in response to entry by a user of a resource identity signifier, a single intended target resource intended by the user to uniquely correspond to the resource identity signifier, among a plurality of resources, the method comprising:

receiving a resource identity signifier from the user (i.e., the user enters a character string, preferably the target URL as in step 51 of Fig. 4); and

accessing a database including an index of resources available on the network and information regarding user feedback gathered in previous executions to determine, based on the information contained in the database, which, if any, of the indexed resources is likely to be the intended target resource (i.e., the character string is indexed into a lexicon of server IP names that have been used by the Web client over a given "history" period to be matched against any entry in the lexicon with respect to a given confidence level to determine the "best" match, i.e., the intended target resource) (Berstis, Fig. 4 and corresponding text, C5: L50 – C6: L1-16).

5. As to claim 2, Berstis teaches the method of claim 1, further comprising: directing a computer of the user so as to enable that computer to connect the user to the address of the resource, if any, determined as likely to be the intended target resource (i.e., if the character "matches" a URL entry in the lexicon by the predetermined threshold, the browser is automatically launched to the "best matched" URL) (Berstis, C6: L12-16).

Art Unit: 2141

6. As to claim 3, Berstis teaches the method of claim 1, wherein a resource is determined, at the accessing step, as likely to be the intended target resource if the database information indicates that a confidence level associated with that resource is of at least a predetermined level (Berstis, C6: L12-16).

7. As to claim 4, Berstis teaches the method of claim 3, wherein if none of the indexed resources have an associated confidence level of at least the predetermined level, the method further comprises the following step:

presenting the user with a list of links to possible resources, the list being ordered on the basis of confidence level, the resources having the highest confidence levels being ranked highest (Berstis, C6: L17-39).

8. Claim 5 is a corresponding combination claim of claims 2 and 4; therefore, it is rejected under the same rationale.

9. Claims 8-12 are corresponding apparatus claims of claims 1-5; therefore, they are rejected under the same rationale.

10. Claims 15-19 are corresponding system claims of claims 1-5; therefore, they are rejected under the same rationale.

Art Unit: 2141

11. Claims 22-26 are corresponding computer-readable storage medium claims of claims 1-5; therefore, they are rejected under the same rationale.

12. Claims 29-31 are corresponding system, method and apparatus claims of claim 1; therefore, they are rejected under the same rationale.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

13. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

**14. Claims 6-7, 13-14, 20-21 and 27-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Berstis, in view of Edlund et al. (US 6,546,388), herein after referred as Edlund.**

15. As to claim 6, Berstis teaches the method of claim 4, but does not explicitly teach if a link has been selected, updating the database information so as to increase the confidence level associated with the mapping between the resource identity signifier and the address of the selected link and vice versa.

Art Unit: 2141

In the related art, Edlund teaches a system and method of metadata search ranking for presenting to an end-user the matching search results of a search in an index list of information wherein a Monitor Agent (component 0205 of Fig. 2) monitors the user's selections of search results. Every time the user selects a search result item for further viewing from the list of results, the Monitor Agent will then update the Ranking Database (component 0207 of Fig. 2) to increase the popularity count/weight (i.e., the confidence level) of the selected URL accordingly (as in step 408 of Fig. 4) (Edlund, Figs. 2, 4, and corresponding text, C9: L17-51 and C10: L50-67).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Berstis and Edlund to update the database (ranking) information so as to increase the confidence level (popularity count/weight) of the selected link (URL) because it would allow the system maintain the current/up to date confidence level (popularity count/weight) of associated indexed resources (URLs, web sites, web pages, links, files, etc) from returned search results in order to determine the order in which the search results are presented and displayed and which of the returned search results is likely to be the intended target resource that the user's computer will be connected to.

16. Claim 7 is a corresponding claim of claim 6; therefore, it is rejected under the same rationale.

Art Unit: 2141

17. Claims 13-14 are corresponding apparatus claims of claims 6-7; therefore, they are rejected under the same rationale.

18. Claims 20-21 are corresponding system claims of claims 6-7; therefore, they are rejected under the same rationale.

19. Claims 27-28 are corresponding computer-readable storage medium claims of claims 6-7; therefore, they are rejected under the same rationale.

20. Further references of interest are cited on Form PTO-892, which is an attachment to this office action.

Art Unit: 2141


21. A shortened statutory period for reply to this action is set to expire THREE (3) months from the mailing date of this communication. See 37 CFR 1.134.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Quang N. Nguyen whose telephone number is (703) 305-8190.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's primary, Le H. Luu, can be reached at (703) 305-9650. The fax phone number for the organization is (703) 746-7239.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3800/4700.

Quang N. Nguyen

  
RUPAL DHARIA  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER